

Many independent observers have charged the elections were riddled with fraud and significant violations of local law. This is not success. The dispute over these elections is yet to be resolved and Haiti is still without a new prime minister.

Sadly, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, the man U.S. troops restored to power, you will remember, with 20,000 U.S. troops, is often cited as an obstacle to essential reform these days, and I am not alone in this dire assessment. A leading scholar of Latin American and the Caribbean area has recently stated that "Haitian democracy is heading for a major derailment." Remember, we spent \$3 billion trying to ensure Haitian democracy.

I am troubled that this administration still points to Haiti as a foreign policy success. If this is a success, we are going to be in serious trouble in other places.

As the New Republic recently pointed out, "The Clinton Administration has achieved less than it might have and almost nothing irreversible," a euphemism for saying we have struck out.

It is time for the administration to lay out a realistic and workable Haiti policy that takes us beyond the involvement of United States troops and further along the road to true democracy in Haiti, as we have all repeatedly asked.

Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration has a number of difficult foreign policy questions that need to be addressed. What is happening in the Middle East? We pick up the papers, we see political assassination attempts, we see uproar going on. The peace process is not working, despite the heroic efforts of some of our folks in their shuttle diplomacy. It is just not happening the way it was supposed to.

What about North Korea? That is not an accident waiting to happen; that is an accident that is happening today. People are starving, it is a country that is in another era, and it is not a friend of Western democracy.

Where do we stand in Africa? Here is a whole continent besieged with incredible grievous obstacles to a future, whether it is starvation, chaos, political problems, genocide, whatever we read about every day in the paper.

So, a legacy is more than just photo ops that declare "Peace in our time has arrived." We need some consistent, long-term foreign policy planning at the White House, and a focused look at what our national interests really are in today's world. When we understand that, perhaps we will be able to effectively protect the United States of America and the peace we want for the world.

TRIBUTE TO ORANGE COUNTY, CA; HEAD START

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. SANCHEZ] is recognized

during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, the recently passed Labor-HHS appropriations bill will provide some of the most cost effective money our Government can spend to protect the health and welfare of all Americans. I am happy to announce that the Orange County Head Start Program just received \$1.3 million in an expansion grant, benefits of the 8-percent increase which the Head Start Program received this year.

This grant will allow additional children to be served through Orange County Head Start programs. Head Start is especially important to me, because I am a Head Start kid. I was one of the first in 1965. My mother and my father, very hard-working parents, working with children and yet below the poverty line, my mother picked up the newspaper one day and read about Head Start and said "This must be a program for Loretta."

I believe that I am the only Head Start kid in Congress. And while I entered that first day into Head Start crying, the fact of the matter was that I learned many things. I learned about peanut butter, I learned about nap time, and, most importantly, I learned how to spell my name and how to speak English.

Head Start helped me to change from a shy, quiet girl, into an inquisitive and eager child, fully prepared to begin kindergarten at the same level as the rest of my classmates. That is why I believe Head Start is one of the best programs that we can help children across the United States with. To this day, Head Start continues to benefit countless children with their mental, their emotional, and their physical development. Head Start also helps families. It helped my mother and my father to understand about parenting, to understand about working with the schools, to understand about helping their children, and they went on to have seven successful college graduated children.

I congratulate Orange County Head Start for their grant award. It is through their efforts that disadvantaged children are getting the Head Start they need.

GLOBAL WARMING: DO NOT OVERREGULATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the subject of global warming. Today marks the beginning of the White House Conference on Global Climate, a precursor to the Kyoto Conference in December.

The conference, of course, is expected to highlight the usual rhetoric, that the world is heating up, the ice is melting, the oceans are rising, that doomsday is fast approaching. Reality, how-

ever, shows that the global warming is still without accurate data for confirmation.

The great majority of the scientists that the administration parades as proof positive of global warming are not really knowledgeable of atmospheric physics, although some may know a lot about forestry, fisheries or agriculture. In other words, the administration is relying mostly on social scientists, policy experts and government functionaries.

Nevertheless, the White House persists in its claims. In fact, they plan to move towards a costly global climate treaty, armed with questionable United Nations intergovernmental panel information on climate change, the IPCC reports, which make the case that the world is heating up and humans are to blame.

But before we rush to judgment, Mr. Speaker, we should know the facts. The 1995 IPCC report lowered its best estimate for warming by about a third from the 1990 IPCC report. In fact, that shows they were off by one-third. Also, the sea level estimates have been reduced. In the 1970's, scientists estimated a 25-foot rise. Today they estimate a 1.5-foot rise.

Why all the uncertainty? Forecasts of global warming rely on computer models which attempt to simulate the Earth's climate. Climate change proponents have always been quick to point out that the models predict a discernible amount of warming resulting from CO₂ buildup. What they are hesitant to discuss is the relative confidence they have in their own models, and in fact confidence levels are low for two main reasons. One is a lack of computer power.

There are 14 orders of magnitude in the climate system. So far researchers have only been able to model the two largest, the planetary scale and the scale of weather disturbances. To model the third, thunderstorms, would require 1,000 times more computer speed.

Even if researchers could model smaller scales, they would run into the second obstacle, a very sketchy understanding of the Earth's climate. Researchers, for example, are still debating the impact of clouds on the Earth's climate. Until these questions are resolved, it is difficult to build models that make accurate predictions.

Now, many scientists think it will be more than a decade before we have the technology to adequately predict the planet's future. Of course, scientists do accept the existence of a natural greenhouse effect in the atmosphere, which has been known since the 19th century and is not to be confused with any influence from human activity. Another accepted fact is that the greenhouse gasses have been increasing as a consequence of an expanding world population, carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels, for instance, and methane from raising cattle. But the climate warming of the past 100 years, which

occurred mainly before 1940, in no way supports the results of computer models that predict a drastic future warming.

The pre-1940 warming is likely a natural recovery from a previous natural cooling. Most important though is the fact that weather observations have shown no global warming trend in the past 20 years whatsoever.

The discrepancy between calculated predictions of warming and the actual observations of no warming has produced a crisis for these scientists. Those who want to believe in global warming keep hoping that proof is just around the corner. In the meantime, unfortunately, it is the American taxpayers who will bear the burden of this uncertainty.

Mr. Speaker, let us be careful not to over regulate.

NATIONAL DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, in North Carolina we are pausing this week to draw attention to the need to focus greater efforts on the problem of domestic violence, and this is National Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Just as we are confronted with the blight of hunger in America, we are faced with the blight of domestic violence, a public and personal health problem. Imagine the incidence of domestic violence in the world if indeed that is the situation that we face in America, that in America some 4 million women are battered every year, every year, one woman every 13 seconds.

It is for that reason the United Nations 4th Conference on Women held in Beijing, China, in September 1995, directly addressed this issue. Violence against women is an obstacle to equality, development, and peace. That was one of the conclusions of the conference.

Another conclusion, violence against women violates both their human rights and their fundamental freedom. Among several other actions to be taken, the conference urged that we condemn violence against women and refrain from invoking any custom, tradition, or religious consideration to avoid our obligation with respect to its elimination.

Being passive in this vital effort is not enough. Merely making the statement that one does not commit domestic violence does not go far enough in solving the problem. We must be proactive. If I may borrow from a well-worn phrase from several decades ago, if you are not part of the solution, you are said to be part of the problem.

Violence against women occurs in nearly every daily area of our lives.

Women are assaulted on the street, at workplaces, in schools and campuses. But it has been the hidden violence in the home at times in our Nation that is particularly difficult. It is the hushed tone, it is not acceptable, it is not talked about. But it is now gaining serious and sensible community-wide attention, as it should be.

Today most States now enact some form of domestic violence legislation and the public has now come to understand that it is a problem. As part of the crime bill, Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act. The President created within the Department of Justice the Violence Against Women Office. Significant funding has been directed toward this problem under the Violence Against Women Act.

Still attitudes are slow to change, and much more needs to be done. Victims of domestic violence continue to face an unacceptable gap in legal representation when required to make appearances in key proceedings affecting their personal safety and the safety of their families.

Domestic violence remains a strong risk factor for female homicide. More women are murdered by their husband or their boyfriends than half of them murdered by strangers. Poor women are still far more likely to be victims of domestic violence than other women, and domestic violence endures as the leading cause of injury to women. More women are indeed harmed by domestic violence than all combined, street accidents, automobile accidents, or assault by strangers. More of their friends harm them and their loved ones than strangers do.

The problem of domestic violence also affects rural areas as well as urban areas. Women of all races, social, religious, ethnic, economic groups, all ages are affected by domestic violence.

Once domestic violence occurs, it reoccurs, and often times it escalates. This week and this month will only have meaning if each of us makes a new commitment to take a firm stand and to understand to do something, no matter how small, to help bring an end to the spread of domestic violence.

Changes begin with awareness, but it happens with action. Condemn violence against women and refrain from invoking any custom, tradition, or religious consideration to avoid our obligation with respect to its elimination. On this issue, each of us can be a part of the solution.

CURE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DILEMMA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized during morning hour debates for 4 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am going to sort of give an hour lecture on Social Security, and I am going to try to do that in 4 minutes.

With these charts, the first chart represents what is going to be happening in Social Security when we have less money coming in in taxes than are required to payout benefits. Since it is a pay-as-you-go system where current taxes immediately go to pay current benefits, and there is no savings or very little savings, it is becoming a bigger and bigger problem.

Look at this chart. A short-term surplus only lasts until 2011, and then the benefits for payouts to retirees are much larger than the taxes coming in. The red on this chart represents what happens to the deficits, how much more money we are going to add to the taxes coming in on Social Security in order to meet the benefit obligations.

You see it goes all the way to \$400 billion a year. There has been a lot of talk about if we just would keep the cotton-picking hands of Congress away from the trust fund, away from the surpluses, but these surpluses now amount today to \$600 billion. Six-hundred billion dollars is not enough to cover benefit payments on Social Security for 2 years. So that is not a long-term solution.

This chart shows what is happening to Americans that are living longer. When we started Social Security in 1935, the average age of death was 61 years old, so most people never even reached the 65-year-old age that entitled them for any benefits. So they died earlier, most people, and Social Security funding was not as big a problem.

As you see on this chart, life expectancy has gone from 61 when we started Social Security, and today it is 74 years old. So people are living longer. That is good, but it makes a problem with keeping the system solvent.

I have introduced a bill, and I will be introducing my next bill in the next few weeks. That has been scored by the Social Security Administration to keep Social Security solvent for the next 75 years. The population growth of seniors is going up at the rate of 73 percent. The population rate of workers is increasing at 14 percent. That means that there is fewer workers paying in their taxes to cover the benefits. So the question is, What do we do?

In 1950, we had 17 people working paying in their taxes for each Social Security recipient. Today there are only three people working. By 2029, there is going to be two people working. We cannot continue to raise taxes on workers in America. We have increased taxes 36 times since 1971. So today most of the American workers pay more in the Social Security tax than they pay in the payroll tax; 78 percent of American workers now pay more in the Social Security tax than they do in the income tax.

Now, here is the bottom line: If you are over 50 years old, you are going to have to live about 26 years after you retire just to break even on the taxes that you and your employer paid into Social Security. That is why private